

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. over the European patent document to Gelati.

Also, the drawings and the specification are objected to and the claims are rejected for formal reasons.

In connection with the Examiner's formal objections and rejections of the drawings, the specification, and the claims, applicant has provided a copy of the drawings with the proposed corrections, amended the specification, and amended the claims correspondingly.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the Examiner's grounds for formal objections and rejections are no longer tenable and these rejections and objections should be withdrawn.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicant has amended claim 1, the

broadest claim on file, so as to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art.

The present invention deals with a unit for connecting conductors to terminals, which is formed as a single block with different elements for quick connection to terminals, each of such elements allowing to connect two conductors and providing connection and disconnection of one of the conductors without affecting the other conductor. In other words, first conductor can be connected and then the other can be connected without disconnecting the first conductor, and the possibility of the operation of disconnecting in the same way is provided.

In the applicant's unit each lever possess a flat top base (10) for pressing down and split in two halves, the rounded band (11a) and pawl (11b) of which is supported on a respective elastic metal band (12) which keeps the lever lifted, with the pawl (11b) retained on the lower edge (13) of the housing small wall (5) as shown in Figure 4.

The unit has symmetrical levers (9a) and (9b) that allow the placement and connection of two conductors (8) and (8a) and for this reason two top divided parts of the elastic metallic band (12) are located under the

levers and arranged symmetrically and independently, and the two contacting bases (14) are also symmetrical and independent, as shown in Figures 1 and 2. This can be seen from Figure 2, one of the two symmetrical levers (9a) is located at a lower place because it is conveniently pressed down. The connection of the conductor does not affect or impair at all the other conductor. The same occurs during the disconnection. This allows the full independent action on each conductor.

The prior art does not teach the new features of the present invention. In order to arrive at these features, the prior art has to be fundamentally modified. However, it is known that in order to arrive at a claimed invention, by modifying the references the cited art must itself contain a suggestion for such a modification.

This principle has also been consistently upheld by the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals which, for example, held in its decision in re Randol and Redford (165 USPQ 586) that

Prior patents are references only for what they clearly disclose or suggestion; it is not a proper use of a patent as a reference to modify its structure to one which prior art references do not suggest.

The prior art has no suggestions for such modifications.

The present invention provides for highly advantageous results which are not accomplished by the known construction. It is well known that in order to support a valid rejection the art must also suggest that it would accomplish applicant's results. This was stated by the Patent Office Board of Appeals, in the case Ex parte Tanaka, Marushima and Takahashi (174 USPQ 38), as follows:

Claims are not rejected on the ground that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to rewire prior art devices in order to accomplish applicants' result, since there is no suggestion in prior art that such a result could be accomplished by so modifying prior art devices.


It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, they share its presumably allowable features, and it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233